



# EXPLORATIONS

# EXPLORATIONS



CONTENTS

*Editor:* MARSHALL MCLUHAN

A Brother to One Intelligence

DR. DANIEL CAPON

Why Do People Scream?

AUDREY FUSS

The cost of printing this issue of *Explorations* is being contributed by the Associates of the University of Toronto, Inc., New York, on behalf of the University of Toronto alumni living in the United States.

---

---

---

## A BROTHER TO ONE INTELLIGENCE

*"A Dirge-Ode to the Sun"*

### I

A shaving from your fingernail, has shot  
the azure cool,  
Refracting into a shaft, that spreads vermillion  
Upon the coral world,  
Oh, brother sun!

## THE SUN AND THE SENSES

*Note Appended to the Poem*

Ordinarily mankind, largely unaware from the cradle to the grave, accepts the environment passively, obliviously. But there is a certain star of the third magnitude, an irremovable fixture in our universe, whether geo- or heliocentric or spinning outward eccentrically, which has commanded concentrated awareness since man first lifted up his face: the Sun. Gods were named for it: in Mesopotamia Shamesh; in Egypt Re; in Greece and Rome Apollo. Religions and priesthoods followed: in Egypt worshipping the sun disk, Aton; in Persia Zoroaster. Breathtaking temples were built to it at Heliopolis, in Athens and throughout the worshipping world. A cosmogeny was fathered by it; also a kingship: le roi soleil, the mikado. A people were named for it: the Inca

## II

There, stand revealed and waft in langrous motion,  
Creatures of the cave; and relics of Ra illumined  
By the dawn of consciousness,  
Oh, brother sun!

## III

The Serpent of the underworld, all black  
but for your wasting battery,  
Shapes his silvery scales into questions,  
unanswered:  
Whence comest thou, and art thou alone?  
Oh, brother sun.

## IV

By what explosive miracle, eons ago,  
Became you enthroned the arbiter of all our motion  
From dawn to dusk and life to death?  
Oh, brother sun.

## V

By whose consent stored you the power  
that will sail the inter-stellar ship,  
While you dry and age our rocks another million years,  
Preparing the re-entry of our own intelligence,  
a half a century older and no wiser?  
Oh, brother sun.

Children of the Sun; and territories called "the lands of the midnight sun". Observatories traced its course 10,000 years ago at Stonehenge. Rites were centred on it: the Semitic and sensuous Astrarte; others: Attis, Dionysus. Stories glorified it, the morning sun: Prince Charming; others horrified Daedalus and Icarus. Objects symbolized it: the soul-bird, the power-bull, the tree of life and death; others symbolized its obverse: seaweed and nocturnal serpents.

Heaven is flooded by the sun and hell smothered by its denial. Music was written for it, directly or indirectly, viz. The Magic Flute and dances choreographed: the Sleeping Beauty. And sacred paintings and sculptures were hidden from it in Buddhist or Zen temples, or the Altamira caves, in windowless churches, and some rituals shut it out among the Navajo tribes or in Nigeria. Houses in California rotate to soak in its rays. Science has studied it throughout

## VI

Or will you be put to shame,  
When extragalactic Odysseus returns from Andromeda,  
With news of bigger brothers to mightier intelligences?  
Brother sun!

## VII

When you installed yourself divider of our Universe,  
What Prometheus stole for you the elemental fire  
That burns like a child, before it cools to  
molecule and matrix,  
To form procrustean bed?  
Oh, brother sun.

## VIII

And, like a child, imploding matter out of doors,  
you vent your rages  
Into space spanning flames,  
Deafening the flapping ears of our radio telescope;  
While we, indoors, listen to the whisperings of the  
Universe,  
Telling tales of our past and future.  
You disturb us!  
Brother sun.

## IX

And then again we, like frightened children,  
Dread the eclipsing of your brotherly, fatherly,  
motherly face,  
Foretelling your premature death and ours;  
Brother sun!

the realms from astrophysics to the biology and biochemistry of photosynthesis and phototropism. The rhythm of our own biological life and even our social life is hinged on it, day and night. It has been our main source of light and heat and, indirectly, of food. Presently we shall harness a little more than a fragment of the millionth part of solar energy dissipating itself on our backs and hats.

But what is our intimate perception of the sun? And what is our contemporary emotional reaction to these percepts? How does it affect our sensory lives? Well, when we fly like Icarus, against the rising sun, we get dyschronosis—the time feels out of joint. When we land, we become dystoptic—the place seems out of joint; and dyscercadic—we feel out of phase. In other words, it affects deeply our spatio-temporal orientation, as it does our biological rhythms, especially that of sleep. In the desert, and in the cauldrons of masonry in New

X

Soon enough, your young genes will draw the fire  
Into the cooling frame of manhood.  
And you'll grow old like us and decay,  
So that other sons may rise on your ashes,  
Oh, brother!

XI

In the light of your shadow, the Yang  
and Yin are born,  
That tear the human heart.  
A man like you, a woman like your sister,  
Joined in the twilight, separate on your rise,  
Brother sun!

XII

From you we learnt, at the horizon, sealing our  
fate to yours,  
The dreaded splendour of incest, covered in redress,  
then crowned in royal purple;  
As you tumble your sister, then pierce  
through the lengthening arms of your mother,  
Brother sun.

York, it feels as cruel as the turned down corners of Apollo's mouth. Victorian ladies, like the depressed and the migrainous, were photophobic; only labourers were bronzed. Australian diggers and much of the middle class, cannibalizing the rest, in the getting-affluent-world, are photophilic, while the Asiatic Indians and the Africans are waiting for the boon of air-conditioning. None but the insensitive fails to be awed, thrilled and deeply moved in proportion to the magnificence of the setting for the rising or departing sun. And Frank Lloyd Wright built himself a church on a rock overlooking the Pacific where the sun transilluminates whenever it smiles on Californians. No, that isn't quite it! What does the sun do for us sensorily? Its pathways are clearly visual and tactile-thermal. Visually, it provides colours, brilliance, beauty, effects of shades, contrast with darkness, after-images. Yet it rarely penetrates, as such, the

### XIII

From you we took the cheery clown to laugh with  
And the chilly cloak with which we wrap  
our graves.  
They're yours to give and yours to take away  
Oh, brother sun!

### XIV

But for your cruel desert we would never know  
the warmth of Eskimo love.  
Nor would your children play in the temple  
priested by a bull,  
And dry on a line like fishes, staple food  
for the Japanese Baal  
Oh, Dog-star, cannibāl!

### XV

While you go the way Copernicus sent you,  
to waste your strength,  
You leave us to conserve your borrowed muscle,  
in the belly of darkness;  
Only to thresh about in the morn,  
Under your cynical smile, brother!

screen of contemporary sleep-dreamers, except when it shines sometimes upon the creature-emptied canvas of schizophrenic dreamland. As any yogi knows, it punishes with blindness those who dare expose their naked eyes to it. Like Yahweh, the non-anthropomorphic sensation of Judeo-Christian deity must not be looked at straight in the burning bush. Those who peep briefly, unlike the scotophilic Tom, are rewarded with gorgeous, orangey after-images when it is very hot; and bluer ones when it is very cold—a pretty effect of thermo-visual sensory interaction.

Its thermal, skin-toning effect is quite dramatic. The modern sun is sensuous. On the bikini-exposed beaches, it is downright erotic. Always, in the copulating spring, it turned a young man's fancy. Nobody is quite sure what it did or does to young ladies; but weddings are most common in the early summer. Whether,

## XVI

You lend a hand to turn our dial  
And sweep the cobwebs clean.  
But the dial runs on, and on, and on;  
And the cobwebs gather again  
Behind your wreathing, weathered face,  
Oh, brother sun!

## XVII

For He who gave you license to produce the show,  
Ordained the dawn of spring into a beginning;  
Set the noon of summer to the height of action  
And flagged the evening of autumn  
    into the lysis of this divine plot.  
So that, in the long night of winter,  
    you will find rest;  
And we, the oblivion that is a prelude  
To the memory which powers rebirth.  
And so that we might circle together,  
    from the future, to the past,  
And into a new beginning,  
Brother sun!

now that sex has come out in the open, the sun's seasonal appearance and weather affect the frequency and intensity of coitus or not, is something for Dr. Kinsey's successors to investigate seriously. One easy index might be a frequency rating of the populations' date of birth, and nine fingers to help arithmetically in antedating this event. Though we are trying to break the out-of-doors, in-doors barriers, and in spite of Freud, I doubt that the sun actually brings sex out of the enclosure, as much as it did in the days when haystacks were more private. Certainly heat varies inversely with passion. While on the kick, it is worth noting that the glory of the sun in springtime and beautiful summers depress the depressed. But it is doubtful that the prolonged appearance and warmth of the sun raises the suicidal rate, across cultures. For the westerner, winter seems to be the lethal season. The other individual, discreet senses are

## XVIII

Unless, oh, unless  
You betray us  
Into betraying you  
Oh, brother sun!  
Then, how shall we know you?  
Brother sun!

affected indirectly: sounds from the radio telescope and radios registering the flare ups or sun spots or the chirruping of returned migratory birds; smell: the drying earth, and hay for fever, and it tickles the nostrils and causes the evil spirit to be sneezed out and the friend to therefore wish the sneezer prolonged health; taste: from thirst, gin and shandy; movement: the greater freedom from clothes, and this has a visuo-tactile erotic feedback almost exclusively to male eyes. For the fortunates who live under the benign rule of a temperate sun, there is little doubt of its magic, healing propensities, whether combatting tuberculosis in sanatoria or helping those who struggle with the evil darkness of other diseases and manage to emerge into the solarium. For them, as for us, the sensory effect is total—coenesthesia—an invigorating, rejuvenating well-being that gives the illusion of energy soaked up, so that one may battle through the dark human underbrush and survive to see another day in the sun.

## XIX

In the coolness of the womb  
How shall we know you're there?  
Brother sun!  
In the bath of solar heat  
Who'll worship at your feet?  
When the chirruping's on tape,  
When we imitate spring's shape,  
When the skin is bronzed and red,  
When we sleep no longer 'n bed,  
And the smell of drying mud  
Erzatz hail, hoofing with thud,  
When we poke our tongues and mock  
Your unnecessary clock;  
When we taste cornucopia  
In an ordinary pharmacia;  
How shall *we* know you're still there,  
Brother sun?

## XX

Oh, we know you ripened corn,  
Made our weather, called the morn',  
But if Joshua blows his horn,  
You'll be dead,  
Brother sun!

What will happen to this enormity of effect, physical, biological, sensory, perceptual and emotional, when future technology intervenes and in part replaces the unique, dramatic and direct effects of the sun, one can vaguely guess. With complete temperature control under a city dome; with diffused light to turn darkness into an artificial day; with melanin injections to bronze the skin (or the antidote to dissolve some pigment for our problem children); with food synthesized; and with the planet brushed up to look a pretty technological device for the astronauts and the lunar emigrants looking back, the sun will become an antique. I think the most dramatic effect will be a change in diurnal rhythms, especially the human rhythm of sleep and vigilance. This will lead the way to a psychosocial revolution. As for the sun, I think we'll can it.

Dr. Daniel Cappon, M.B., F.R.C.P., *Assistant Professor of Psychiatry, U. of T.*

## WHY DO PEOPLE SCREAM?

This paper will attempt to examine screaming as a social fact.

The first hypothesis is: *To the degree to which a group of people is characterized by the use of "public language" in a culture, the people in that group will use loud language or screaming to communicate with one another: to the degree that a group of people is characterized by the use of "formal language," the people in that group will not use loud language or screaming to communicate with one another.*<sup>1</sup> (See footnote 1 for definitions of terms.)

In further explanation of the hypothesis it is postulated: Individuals tend to raise their voices or scream because they cannot communicate at the ordinary conversational tone. This is extrapolation from Mead.<sup>2</sup> This derived postulate includes the assumptions that (a) screaming is a form of communication; (b) screaming is linked with public and formal language. Corollary to this is that the link is stronger with the public than with the formal language.

1. A. BERNSTEIN, B., "Some Social Determinants of Perception," *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 9, No. 2, June, 1958. Bernstein defines *public language* as language characterized by simple, broad, concrete categories, umbrella expressions and non-abstractions. *Formal language* refers to the use of words referring to concepts or abstractions, as opposed to things. *Expressive symbolism* designates the use of gestures, tone of voice, loudness or softness of speech, symbols *other than* words which express meaning in communication. Loud language and screaming are types of expressive symbolism. Bernstein calls expressive symbolism a third kind of language, in addition to public and formal. *Communication* as used here follows the symbolic interactionist theory of George Herbert Mead.<sup>2</sup> It consists of (1) speech, thought, gesture or symbol of the actor addressed to the other; (2) reception of (1) by the other; (3) completion of the gesture by the interpretation by the other, and indication back to the actor that completion has taken place, either by verbal or other response.
2. MEAD, GEORGE HERBERT, *Mind, Self and Society*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1934.

The hypothesis could be applied to any cultures or subcultures thought to display as characteristics the variables mentioned. For simplicity and clarity this discussion is limited to literate cultures.<sup>3</sup>

We shall attempt to apply the hypothesis first to the English culture, in particular, the middle and working classes as subcultures.<sup>4</sup>

Bernstein, using the linguistic approach, examined the differences in middle and working class boys. He found that the level or type of language determines and limits the character of thought that takes place. That is, the working class boys who were limited to public language and expressive symbolism were relatively limited in their abilities to convey meaning, manipulate ideas and make distinctions, whereas the middle class boys who commanded all three types of language, public, formal and expressive symbolism, were better able to convey meaning, as evidenced by performance in school.

If public language and formal language are separately linked to class, working and middle respectively, perhaps the character of the expressive symbolism used helps to explain the difference in class. If it is true, as assumed, that people raise their voices or scream because they cannot communicate at the ordinary conversational tone, then those people who command only simple, non-abstract, emotional categories to express their thoughts will have less categories to choose from, as the number of words available for concrete things or experience are limited in the English language. It will be hard for the other to interpret the gesture for the same reasons, and they therefore will call upon screaming or raising the voice as an aid to communication.

On the other hand, where formal language is used, the abstractions are numerous and the symbolism is of many possible varieties. If communication fails at first, the almost limitless combination of words to express concepts or ideas possible in English can be used. The other, having command of these same abstractions by virtue of sharing the same subculture, will more likely understand, and communication will be completed. The likelihood of loudness or screaming occurring will be less.

In the family, in the early years when it is necessary for socialization to attach meanings to the physical world and activities for the child, much communication takes place with concrete objects as referents, regardless of class.

- 
3. For a definitive statement, it would of course be necessary to analyze the phenomenon in many cultures, both pre-literate and literate. In a communication to the writer, Marshall McLuhan suggests consideration of the effects of literacy on vocal behavior. See his *The Gutenberg Galaxy*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1962, for this exciting and provocative approach.
  4. The concept of culture used in this paper is that taken from Ruth Benedict, *Patterns of Culture*, Mentor Book, New York, 1959. That is, culture is considered as learned mode of behavior transmitted from generation to generation. Cultures have "patterns" or central themes which effect "patterns" of behavior in the people (in this case screaming).

But sentiments and emotions, which are most important in primary relations such as family relations, do not have immediate concrete referents. Therefore, the full meaning of many of the seemingly simple commands and sentences that are also charged with feelings and emotions can be very hard to communicate without the use of formal language.

For instance, "wash the dishes" might involve simply "it's your turn," or "it's not your turn but of course you'll do it anyway for the family's sake" or "because work is highly valued in this house as an expression of the central meaning of life" or almost endless other unspoken completions, which are such an important part of communication.

In the working class setting, we'd expect screaming if the request went unheeded.

In the middle class family the same command, if not followed by completion, is more likely to be followed by a lecture on the nature of work, or importance of learning the female role early in life, than by screaming or yelling. Abstract ideas or categories are familiar to the middle class group as opposed to the working class, and their evocation will result in the desired behavior.

Let us look at some suggestive evidence.

Is the working class of England characterized by the use of public language?

Besides Bernstein's findings, the following quotations from Hoggart suggest limited command of language:

Thus, working-class speech and manners in conversation are more abrupt, less provided with emollient phrases than those of other groups; their arguments are often conducted in so rude a way that a stranger might well think that . . . fighting would follow . . . the physical conditions of the working lives . . . are not conditions which produce measured tones or the more padded conversational allowances . . . They have had little or no training in the handling of ideas or analysis.<sup>5</sup>

Are the middle classes in England characterized by the use of formal language? This is implicit in the above quotation, as in all such statements:

It is true that you can find . . . a form of intonation created for the expression of those thoughts, attitudes and sentiments attributed to the upper class. It has exaggerated vowel sounds and a bored, lazy intonation because of the tendency of the average upper class person to inhibit his emotions, understate his thoughts and preserve immobile features.<sup>6</sup>

Does there seem to be differential raising of the voice and screaming in the two classes? It's hard to picture a "haughty, immobile mien" accompanying screaming.

- 
5. HOGGART, RICHARD, *The Uses of Literacy*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1961, pp. 74-5.
  6. PEAR, T. H., *English Social Differences*, London, George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1955, p. 230.

Among the middle classes, "speak softly" has a long tradition: King Lear, trying to revive the dead Cordelia:

... Her voice was ever soft, gentle, and low—  
an excellent thing in woman.<sup>7</sup>

Professor Higgins and Eliza Doolittle are the archetypes.

T. H. Pear says:

... and a low-pitched voice is often deliberately nurtured by women (describing a book on etiquette.) . . . the advantages that children from good residential areas have is being encouraged to talk and discuss with courteous attention to other speakers . . .<sup>8</sup>

And about the working class:

The rows which are so much a part of the life of any working-class neighbourhood, . . . can be easily misinterpreted. In narrow terraced streets, within thin party-walls, they could hardly be kept private anyhow, unless they were conducted in very subdued voices . . . They certainly are not quietly conducted . . . it is accepted that disputes . . . will arise from time to time, and that they will erupt into vivid, quick, noisy war.<sup>9</sup>

There is a mass of evidence of type of speech as differentiating class in T. H. Pear's *English Social Differences*. If we combine this with the Bernstein analysis of command of language, and the other quotations we have cited, we can conclude on this inferential evidence that our hypothesis can not be rejected. The English working class seems to be characterized by screaming linked with public language, while the English middle classes exhibit relative lack of screaming, while using formal language.

However, in view of the inferential and indirect nature of our evidence, the fact that our hypothesis seems to hold for these two classes in England is not enough. Let us examine another culture and see if our variables are linked with class there:

Dorothy Lee, in describing the culture of the Greeks, states:

*Couvenda*, conversation, is a recognized form of 'passing the time,' of entertainment. *Couvenda* is rarely desultory, or the mere exchange of information. It is usually contrapuntal virtuosity, incisive, combative, loud; and the loudness is such a familiar quality of conversation that radios are turned on much too loud for the ears of foreigners . . . A discussion is a battle of personal opinion . . . its end is sheer enjoyment of vigorous speech.<sup>10</sup>

- 
7. SHAKESPEARE, WM., *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*, Blackwell Wielandy, St. Louis, Mo., (n.d.), p. 1064.
  8. PEAR, op. cit., p. 107.
  9. HOGGART, op. cit., p. 76.
  10. LEE, DOROTHY, *Freedom and Culture*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1959, p. 146.

We seem to have a deviant case here. This quotation obviously refers to the mode of the whole culture, and is not class linked. There are three famous Greek movies which all show loud speech behavior: the innkeeper's wife in *He Who Must Die*, the cafe scene in *Never on Sunday*, and Anthony Quinn and others in *Zorba the Greek*. The degree of screaming does not vary with class; everyone screams, the expressive symbolism seems to run right through the culture.

Interviews conducted for this study with modern Greeks suggest that indeed, this is so. One informant volunteered that of course middle and upper class persons, even the ex-king, would raise their voices, both *en famille* and otherwise: "It is good to feel emotion, and express it."

Thus, it would seem that among the Greeks loud language, screaming and expressive symbolism are not linked to class.<sup>11</sup>

Then to what is screaming linked in Greece? The Greeks are an expressive people, from the classic portrait by Edith Hamilton in the lyrical first chapter of *The Greek Way*:

... Greece resisted and rejoiced and turned full-face to life ... something quite new came into the world; the joy of life found expression ... the Greeks were the first people in the world to play; and they have played on a great scale. . . .<sup>12</sup>

to modern times, as we have seen in Lee. Perhaps the idea that where the culture values expression of emotion, joy, sorrow, anger, and other states of feeling, loud speech and screaming are sanctioned, or at least are not proscribed, provides another more generalized hypothesis: *To the degree to which a culture is characterized by the sanctioned expression of emotion, the people in it will exhibit the personality characteristic of loud speech or screaming in intercommunication: to the degree to which a culture is characterized by the*

11. CHARLES MOSKOS, of the Sociology Department, Michigan University, tells the following story: (He is of Greek descent.) In the Greek National Bank of Los Angeles he heard a loud dispute between a customer of the bank and a minor bank officer, both Greeks, regarding a loan. No agreement could be reached. The officer said "Just a minute, I'll get the manager." Moskos thought, "Now I'll see whether the upper class behavior differs." In a few moments the manager appeared, the situation was explained, and the argument resumed, at the same pitch and intensity, replete with gesture.

The same seems to be true of the Cubans, according to columnist Paul Coates in the *Los Angeles Times* of November 10, 1965. In a column on the Cuban refugees in Miami, Florida, who are from all classes in Cuba, he quotes the Miami police: "They're not generally violent people, but they're boisterous. They just make one helluva lot of noise . . . We drive by, hear them yelling and think we've got a fight on our hands. It turns out that's just their way of having a friendly discussion."

12. HAMILTON, EDITH, *The Greek Way to Western Civilization*, Mentor Book, New York, 1948, p. 15.

sanctioned control of emotion, the people in it will exhibit the personality characteristic of speech that is not loud or screaming in intercommunication.

Consider cursorily the stereotypic "picture in the head" that we of the West hold of the following "national characters:"

EMOTIONAL	UNEMOTIONAL
<i>Loud Speech/Screaming</i>	<i>Not Loud Speech/Screaming</i>
Greek	British
Italian	Scandinavian
Spanish	German
Cuban	Mexican*
Latin American	Chinese*
French	Egyptian*
American*	Indian*

It would seem the "picture" is comparatively, significantly different, with reference to the sanctioned display of emotion. The countries listed under "emotional" are the ones where one associates the national character with exuberance, flamboyance, gay music, joy of life, and excitability and loud, expressive joy and sorrow. Contrariwise, the British, Scandinavian and German characters are typically regarded as valuing striving for control of emotion, the ideal being to show the world a sober mien. In these cultures it is regarded as almost indecent to display emotion.

Why are these two groups of peoples different in the values placed on control of emotions? Is there perhaps something in the collective representations<sup>13</sup> of each of these two groups of cultures that is common to the members of each group?

These values of control of display of emotion do not come from the economic system (capitalism prevails in all these countries—we refer to the "old" Cuba and China and assume the national character has not changed.) Nor do they come from the child rearing practices, as Kardiner might have it, since they differ widely within each group.

There is something related to the expression of emotion that is common to the British, Scandinavian and German cultures. This is, in a general way, the group of collective representations historically having to do with the Protestant ethic in its pure or Calvinist form, much attenuated now but still having important behavioral consequences.

According to this doctrine, man's important communication is with God, to whom he is dedicated body and soul and by whom he is or is not chosen for salvation of his soul. His dedication is proven by ceaseless activity, leaving no

13. The large, shared, value-carrying ideas of a culture, i.e. "democracy." The term is from Durkheim, Emile, *The Division of Labor in Society*, tr. George Simpson, Free Press of Glencoe, Illinois, 1933.

energies or effort for "enjoyment of life" in the sense we have used it. Enjoyment is a sin, in itself and because it takes away from God. Life is life eternal, and all man's days on this earth must be dedicated to eventual entry to the Kingdom of Heaven. It would be unseemly to display emotion, and a sign of weakness of faith.

The countries listed under "emotional" are, with the exception of America, traditionally *not* dominated by the Protestant Ethic, but by the ethos of the Catholic Church, where the particular ethos of a non-sanctioned display of emotion does not hold, the doctrine of man's relations and duties to God being very different—as long as one observes the religious and civil laws, and one's *intentions* are good (toward the church and God) one may lead one's private life as one wishes. The expression of private emotions is not linked to religion.

As to the other countries, starred in the above list, we would hold that they are "mixed" with regard to the variable under discussion, display of emotion, following Florence Kluckhohn's explanation that competing values are strongly held, resulting in overlapping.<sup>14</sup> For instance, in the case of Mexico, it is suggested here that the traditional control and undemonstrativeness of the Indian heritage represents one ideal regarding display of emotion, and the Spanish heritage the opposite, accounting for both modes of behavior observed there, and the designation "mixed." The polyglot nature of heritages in America would have to be sorted out to account for several modes. Rose Hum Lee indicates two modes in the case of the Chinese, and makes a distinction between classes.<sup>15</sup> In the Egyptian and Indian cultures we could make comparable analyses.

The valued mode of control of emotions seems to be related to the system of religious beliefs, paralleling the Protestant Ethic in effect, or not.

This cursory examination of the two hypotheses leads to the conclusion that, on the basis of the evidence presented, we cannot reject either one.

Our exploration of this phenomenon, screaming, as a social fact indicates that more systematic and exhaustive inquiry might lead to interesting additions to knowledge of culture and personality.

Audrey Fuss, *Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of California, Los Angeles.*

---

14. KLUCKHOHN, FLORENCE ROCKWOOD, "Dominant and Variant Value Orientations," in *Personality in Nature, Society and Culture*, ed. Clyde Kluckhohn and Henry A. Murray, N. Y., Knopf, 1962, pp. 342-60.

15. LEE, ROSE HUM, *The Chinese People in the U.S.A.*, Oxford U. Press, 1960.